



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

first syllable. These are never paroxytone (◡ ◡), but properispomena (◡ ◡). I cannot conceive why Brugmann says in note 1 on page 86 that *ῥῆς* cannot be regarded as having the recessive accent, because *ῥῆς* and *ῥῶν* are not recessive. From the beginning *ῥῆς* had the acute accent on the penult (Pan-Hellenic **vāF-es* = Sk. *nāv-as*), and the change of the acute to the circumflex is the precise circumstance which characterizes the accent as recessive. The conservatism of *ῥῆς* and *ῥῶν* in retaining their respective etymological accents, notwithstanding the fact that there are recessively accented forms in the same paradigm, is of a piece with the generally more pertinacious resistance which oxytones and words having the I. E. slurred tone—see my essay, p. 17, note—on the ultimate (*ῥῶν*) exhibit throughout; cf. *ibid.*, pp. 31–2. The fact that all barytone dissyllables in the language are properispomena (◡ ◡) is due to the ascendancy of a certain accentual type which overrides all etymological considerations; the difference between Aeolic and Attic-Ionic is that in the former all the recessive types emanating from the finite verb have overridden the etymological accents, while in the latter only the type ◡ ◡ has conquered the entire territory. The remaining verbal accentual types in Attic-Ionic have, however, also in various degrees infringed upon the non-verbal forms, as I have shown in the article cited above.

I need scarcely say in conclusion that Brugmann's work ought to belong to the familiar apparatus of every Indo-European philologist. It offers a well-considered, soberly written grammar of the sounds and inflections of every I. E. language, resting on the broad basis of an incisive knowledge of all of them. Excellent bibliographical statements accompany all the chapters, tending to stimulate further research on any given point. The entire work is pervaded by a fine historical spirit; it cannot fail to attract an increasing number of scholars to a keener interest in that subtle, intense, constantly active life which pervades the formal side of our languages, rendering them in a supreme degree capable of being efficient vehicles for the correspondingly subtle, intense and constantly active Indo-European thought.

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.

Wörterbuch zu Xenophons Anabasis; für den Schulgebrauch bearbeitet von FERDINAND VOLLBRECHT. Siebente verbesserte Auflage besorgt unter Mitwirkung von Dr. WILHELM VOLLBRECHT. Mit 78 in den Text eingedruckten Holzschnitten, drei lithographierten Tafeln und mit einer Übersichtskarte. Leipzig, Druck und Verlag von B. G. Teubner, 1891.

The seventh and latest edition of the standard vocabulary to Xenophon's *Anabasis*, by Ferdinand Vollbrecht, of Hanover, Germany, revised by his son, Dr. Wilhelm Vollbrecht, Oberlehrer zu Ratzeburg, has just appeared.

The system of studying the classics by the aid of special vocabularies, which is rapidly gaining ground in our American schools, is essentially German, and amongst the best of these special dictionaries is this of Dr. Vollbrecht, elaborated from the original one by his father.

To one who has examined the vocabularies of the *Anabasis* now in use in America, it is plain that the dictionary in question lies at the basis of them all, both from the character of their definitions and, especially, from their references to the text. The exact improvements of this seventh edition,

dated Hanover and Ratzeburg, February, 1891, consist partly of a number of alterations and improvements in accordance with the observations of Nitsche in the *Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie*, 1887, No. 36. Other changes were adopted from various historical papers and from Schmidt's *Handbuch der Synonymik*. One noteworthy alteration, illustrative of the effect of modern archaeological research, is the withdrawal of one of the engravings, with its accompanying description, explanatory of *διαγκνλόμαι* (Anab. IV 3, 28). This engraving was originally derived from Bötticher's *Olympia*, but according to the more recent investigations of Wassmansdorff has been shown to have a doubtful bearing, if any, on the subject. It was based on the figure in the great altar-frieze of Pergamon, of the giant's hand apparently in the act of throwing a spear, but Wassmansdorff's researches have invalidated this idea, and leave us, as before, and with less perplexity, to the representations on ancient vases for the correct explanation of *διαγκνλόμαι*.

Altogether the work is as nearly perfect as, with our present knowledge, it could be, and no student of Greek literature nor teacher of Xenophon's works can well afford to be without it.

CHARLES TUDOR WILLIAMS.

Johann Elias Schlegel als Trauerspieldichter mit besonderer Berücksichtigung seines Verhältnisses zu Gottsched. Von Dr. JOHANNES RENTSCH. Leipzig, Paul Beyer, 1890.

In the heat of the strife between the Leipziger and Züricher many significant signs of the times were lost from view. It is difficult even after a hundred and fifty years to review the Gottsched-Bodmer feud and not join in the general condemnation of the lifeless doctrines of the great Leipzig dictator. Fortunately, however, students of this period are beginning to turn their attention to those men who, though little renowned as partisans, nevertheless represented the unbiassed—let us say rather the normal—attitude in literary criticism. Such a man was Johann Elias Schlegel, the worthy predecessor of his illustrious nephews, August Wilhelm and Friedrich. To us Schlegel's greatest importance lies in his soundness of view in literary matters and his manly and unpartisan spirit in his relation both to Gottsched and Bodmer. Rentsch, in the work before us, following a suggestion of Danzel, presents for the first time a clear and satisfactory view of the successive stages of Schlegel's association with Gottsched. Beginning with the performance of 'Orest und Pylades,' which gained Schlegel access to Gottsched, Rentsch sets forth Schlegel's independent attitude and literary activity in Gottsched's 'Vormittägige Rednergesellschaft,' in the 'Critische Beyträge,' in the strife with the Swiss, and in the contributions to Gottsched's 'Schaubühne,' and traces Schlegel's gradual withdrawal from his intolerant master and final union with Bodmer through his contributions to the 'Bremer Beiträge,' and his association particularly with Hagedorn. In this as well as in the other two chapters on the Sources, Content, Structure, Speech and Metre of the tragedies, Rentsch has shown Schlegel to be in tragedy what Danzel and Antoniewicz have claimed for him in aesthetics, a forerunner of Lessing!

M. D. LEARNED.